

17 March 1953

MEMORANDUM FOR: Colonel White

1. The attached O&M study proposes placing each operation involved in overseas processing in one of two categories--"technical" or "nontechnical or clerical"--and to assign all "technical" operations to the Passenger Movement Branch (P&SO) and all "nontechnical or clerical" steps to the Central Processing Branch (Personnel). Since four traffic officers are now in CPB (doing "technical" work), they would be transferred to P&SO.

2. I am skeptical as to whether simply labeling operations on this basis and distributing functions according to these identifications will accomplish smooth administration of overseas processing. The O&M study states that "the split in responsibility prevents adequate coordination and control, and the preparation of clear-cut processing procedures." (Paragraph 4b.) The O&M plan would not eliminate dual responsibility and, therefore, would do little to ease the attendant difficulties of coordination.

3. Proper meshing of all operations can probably be realized only by making one office responsible for the total job. This point is made by Personnel in nonconcurring in the O&M recommendation. Personnel states that the function is essentially a "personnel-type job"; apparently, because it is an employee service. My own feeling is that it falls more nearly into a transportation service category and that the entire function should be consolidated under the Transportation Division, Procurement and Supply Office.

4. Presently, the T/O situation is:

Central Processing Branch	21 (includes two detailed personnel-- one from P&SO and one from Medical)
Passenger Movement Branch	15
Total	36

Under O&M Proposal

Central Processing Branch	16 (5 traffic officers moved to P&SO)
Passenger Movement Branch	24 (including 5 traffic officers from CPB)
Total	40

Personnel proposes that through consolidation the T/O for the total function could be reduced to 33.

1 Att

MISSING PAGE

ORIGINAL DOCUMENT MISSING PAGE(S):

missing attachment